



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,687	09/05/2003	James Alfred Thompson	17065/004001	8553
22511 7590 12/24/2008 OSHA LIANG L.L.P. TWO HOUSTON CENTER 909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500 HOUSTON, TX 77010				
EXAMINER				
MENDOZA, JUNIOR O				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2423				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/24/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/656,687

Applicant(s)

THOMPSON, JAMES ALFRED

Examiner

JUNIOR O. MENDOZA

Art Unit

2423

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-19 and 21-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-19 and 21-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 19, 30 and 39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. **Claims 17 and 29** are objected to because of the following informalities:

Applicant cancelled claims 2 and 20 from which claims 17 and 29 were correspondingly dependant. For examination purposes the examiner takes the position of having claims 17 and 29 depend from independent claims 1 and 19, respectively.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 3 – 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 30, 33, 35 – 37 and 39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler et al. (Pub No US 2004/0128508) in view of Christatos (Patent No US 4,502,609) further in view of Vitale et al. (Patent No US 7,111,318). Hereinafter, referenced as Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale respectively.

Regarding **claim 1**, Wheeler discloses an authentication device configured to obtain authentication information from an authentication medium (Paragraph [0022]; also exhibited on figure 10);

an electronic access control system operatively connected to an access administration system over a network infrastructure (Paragraphs [0059] [0095]; fig 10, the requesting entity 12 sends an access request via a communication medium, such as the internet, intranet or a physical wiring),

wherein the electronic access control system is configured to grant access to the restricted area upon receiving verification of the authentication information (Paragraphs [0022] [0095], figure 10),

and a lock operatively connected to the access control system, wherein the lock is configured to receive a signal from the access control system to electronically unlock the restricted area when access to the cable distribution box is granted (Paragraphs [0022] [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements

mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Christatos fail to explicitly disclose establishing a connection with a remote system over cable network infrastructure.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Vitale discloses establishing a connection with a remote system over cable network infrastructure (Col. 5 lines 29-33 and 42-44, col. 22 lines 53-64, figure 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Christatos by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Vitale, for the purpose implementing a transmission medium that is already available, which avoids the necessity to build and maintain a different infrastructure in order to send data from a remote place to a base station, which saves funds for the company.

Regarding **claim 3**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses a communication device operatively connected to the access control system and configured to provide communication services between the access control system and the access administration system (Paragraph [0059] fig 10).

Regarding **claim 4**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the communication device is at least one selected from the group consisting of a communication adapter and a cable modem (Paragraph [0059] also exhibited on fig 10; communication medium is the internet, where the internet implements modems for communication).

Regarding **claim 5**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of access administration hardware, access administration software, and firmware (Access authentication component [16], paragraph [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

Regarding **claim 6**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access control system comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of access control software, access control hardware, and firmware (Requesting entity [12] gains access through card reader [224], paragraph [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

Regarding **claim 7**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the authentication device is a card reader and the authentication medium is an access card (Requesting entity [12] gains access through card reader [224] by presenting card [22], paragraph [0095] fig 10).

Regarding **claim 9**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system is configured to collect the authentication information (Paragraphs [0088] [0094] [0095] also exhibited on figure 10).

Regarding **claim 10**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system is configured to generate a work log from the authentication information and the work log data (Paragraphs [0088] [0094] [0095] fig 10).

Regarding **claim 12**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system is configured to verify the authentication information using a request-response authentication method (Paragraph [0008]; refer to claim 6 of the reference).

Regarding **claim 13**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system is configured to verify the authentication information using a challenge-response authentication method (Paragraph [0086]; the authentication factors of the system [160] requires knowledge of secret confidential information such as a PIN number).

Regarding **claim 15**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that communication between the access administration system and the access control system is encrypted (Transmission of personal information requires encryption, paragraph [0012]).

Regarding **claim 30**, Wheeler discloses a method for accessing a restricted area, comprising: obtaining authentication information from an authentication medium (Paragraph [0022]; fig 10);

sending an access request over a network infrastructure to an access administration system, wherein the access request comprises the authentication information (Paragraphs [0059] [0095]; fig 10, the requesting entity 12 sends an access request via a communication medium, such as the internet, intranet or a physical wiring);

verifying the access request by the access administration system (Paragraphs [0022] [0095] also exhibited on fig 10);

generating a work log associated with the access request (Paragraph [0077] also exhibited on fig 10);

and granting access to the restricted area when the access request is verified, where the granting access to the restricted area comprises electronically unlocking the restricted area (Paragraphs [0022] [0095], also exhibited on fig 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Christatos fail to explicitly disclose establishing a connection with a remote system over cable network infrastructure.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Vitale discloses establishing a connection with a remote system over cable network infrastructure (Col. 5 lines 29-33 and 42-44, col. 22 lines 53-64, figure 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Christatos by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Vitale, for the purpose implementing a transmission medium that is already available, which avoids the necessity to build and maintain a different infrastructure in order to send data from a remote place to a base station, which saves funds for the company.

Regarding **claim 33**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the method of claim 30, moreover, Wheeler discloses unlocking the restricted area when access has been granted (Paragraphs [0022] [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

Regarding **claims 35 and 37**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose all the limitations of claims 35 and 37; therefore, claims 35 and 37 are rejected for the same reasons as in claims 5 and 6, respectively.

Regarding **claim 36**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access to the restricted area is granted by an access control system (Paragraph [0095]; fig 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

Regarding **claim 39**, Wheeler discloses an apparatus for accessing a restricted area, comprising: means for obtaining authentication information from an authentication medium (Paragraph [0022]; fig 10);

means for sending an access request over a network infrastructure to an access administration system, wherein the access request comprises the authentication information (Paragraphs [0022] [0095]; fig 10);

means for verifying the access request; means for generating a work log associated with the access request (Paragraphs [0077] [0095]; figure 10).

and means for electronically unlocking the restricted area when the access request is verified (Paragraphs [0077] [0095]; also exhibited on figure 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

However, it is noted that Wheeler and Christatos fail to explicitly disclose establishing a connection with a remote system over cable network infrastructure.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Vitale discloses establishing a connection with a remote system over cable network infrastructure (Col. 5 lines 29-33 and 42-44, col. 22 lines 53-64, figure 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler and Christatos by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Vitale, for the purpose implementing a transmission medium that is already available, which avoids the necessity to build and maintain a different infrastructure in order to send data from a remote place to a base station, which saves funds for the company.

5. **Claims 19, 21 – 23, and 25 – 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler in view of Christatos.

Regarding **claim 19**, Wheeler discloses an authentication device configured to obtain authentication information from an authentication medium (Paragraph [0022]; also exhibited on figure 10);

a memory operatively connected to the authentication device comprising verification information and work log data (Paragraphs [0059] [0095], fig 10);

and an access control system operatively connected to the authentication device and the memory, wherein the electronic access control system is configured to grant access to the restricted area based on the verification information and the authentication information (Paragraphs [0022] [0077] [0095]; figure 10);

a lock operatively connected to the access control system, wherein the lock is configured to receive a signal from the access control system to electronically unlock the restricted area when access to the restricted area is granted (Paragraphs [0022] [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

Regarding **claims 21, 22, 23, 25, and 26**, Wheeler and Christatos disclose all the limitations of claims 21, 22, 23, 25, and 26; therefore, claims 21, 22, 23, 25, and 26 are rejected for the same reasons as in claims 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13, respectively.

6. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler in view of Christatos further in view of Vitale and further in view of Harold et al. (Patent No US 6,472,973). Hereinafter referenced as Harold.

Regarding **claim 8**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 7; moreover, Wheeler discloses an access administration system (Paragraph [0095] also exhibited on fig 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale fail to explicitly disclose that the access administration system includes functionality to disable the access card.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Harold discloses that the access administration system includes functionality to disable the access card (Column 5 lines 24-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Harold, for the purpose of avoiding access of unwanted people to the cable box, where disabling the card is a fast and efficient way to do so.

7. **Claims 11, 24, 31 and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler in view of Christatos further in view of Vitale and further in view of Naidoo et al. (Pub No US 2002/0147982). Hereinafter referenced as Naidoo.

Regarding **claim 11**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 10; moreover, Wheeler discloses that the access administration system includes functionality to analyze the access action to determine whether a response is required (Paragraph [0081]).

However, it is noted that Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale fail to explicitly disclose the functionality to send an alert to an appropriate entity if the response is required.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Naidoo discloses the functionality to send an alert to an appropriate entity if the response is required (Paragraph [0076]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale by specifically providing such element, as taught by Naidoo, for the purpose of notifying the company and the police about a possible unauthorized access to the cable box, in order to take action as soon as possible increasing the chances to catch the criminal.

Regarding **claim 24**, Wheeler, Christatos and Naidoo disclose all the limitations of claim 24; therefore, claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as in claim 11.

Regarding **claim 31**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale discloses the method of claim 30; moreover, Wheeler discloses uploading the work log to the access administration system (Paragraphs [0059] [0077]);

analyzing the work log to determine whether a response is required (Paragraph [0081]).

However, it is noted that Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale fail to explicitly disclose sending an alert to an appropriate entity if the response is required.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Naidoo discloses sending an alert to an appropriate entity if the response is required (Paragraph [0076]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale by specifically providing such element, as taught by Naidoo, for the purpose of notifying the company and the police about a possible unauthorized access to the cable box, in order to take action as soon as possible increasing the chances to catch the criminal.

Regarding **claim 32**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale discloses the method of claim 30; moreover, Wheeler discloses a restricted area (abstract). However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

However, it is noted that Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale fail to explicitly disclose continuously monitoring the restricted area to determine the status.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Naidoo discloses continuously monitoring the cable distribution box to determine the status (Paragraph [0016]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale by specifically providing such element, as taught by Naidoo, for the purpose of keeping control at all times of who has access to the restricted area.

8. **Claims 14, 27 and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler in view of Christatos further in view of Vitale and further in view of Rowe (Pub No US 2004/0050930). Hereinafter referenced as Rowe.

Regarding **claim 14**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses that communication data is encrypted (Paragraphs [0009] [0012]).

However, it is noted that Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale fail to explicitly disclose that communication between the authentication device and the access control system is encrypted.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Rowe discloses that communication between the authentication device and the access control system is encrypted (Paragraph [0002] [0031]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale by specifically providing such element, as taught by Rowe, for the purpose of providing a high level of security which decreases the chances for private data to be stolen.

Regarding **claim 27**, Wheeler, Christatos and Rowe disclose all the limitations of claim 27; therefore, claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons as in claim 14.

Regarding **claim 34**, Wheeler, Christatos, Vitale and Rowe disclose all the limitations of claim 34; therefore, claim 34 is rejected for the same reasons as in claim 14.

9. **Claims 16, 17 18, 28, 29 and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wheeler in view of Christatos further in view of Vitale and further in view of Rich et al. (Pub No US 2004/0071382). Hereinafter referenced as Rich.

Regarding **claim 16**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses a restricting area comprising an authentication device, the access administration system, and the access control system (Paragraphs [0077] [0095] also exhibited on figure 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique

to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

However, it is noted that Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale fail to explicitly disclose that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Rich discloses that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the device (Paragraphs [0011] - [0013]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale by specifically providing such element, as taught by Rich, for the purpose of eliminating the need to include two or more different set of cables, for data transmission and for providing power, which saves money.

Regarding **claim 17**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 1; moreover, Wheeler discloses a restricted area comprising a lock (Paragraphs [0077] [0095] also exhibited on figure 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

However, it is noted that Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale fail to explicitly disclose that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Rich discloses that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the cable distribution box (Paragraphs [0011] - [0013]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale by specifically providing such element, as taught by Rich, for the purpose of eliminating the need to include two or more different set of cables, for data transmission and for providing power, which saves money.

Regarding **claim 18**, Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale disclose the cable distribution box of claim 3; moreover, Wheeler discloses restricted area comprising a communication device (Paragraphs [0077] [0095] also exhibited on figure 10).

However, it is noted that Wheeler fails to explicitly disclose that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking device.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Christatos discloses that the restricted area is a cable distribution box with a locking mechanism (Col. 3 lines 14-17, col. 4 lines 48-61 also exhibited on figures 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler by specifically providing the elements mentioned above, as taught by Christatos, for the purpose applying a known technique to improve the security aspects of a cable distribution box locking mechanism for a predictable result of discouraging the theft of cable services, allowing companies to protect their product more competently by implementing a more efficient and sophisticated security mechanism.

However, it is noted that Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale fail to explicitly disclose that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the cable distribution box.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor Rich discloses that the components are powered using current obtained from a cable line operatively connected to the cable distribution box (Paragraphs [0011] - [0013]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wheeler, Christatos and Vitale by specifically providing such element, as taught by Rich, for the purpose of eliminating the need to include two or more different set of cables, for data transmission and for providing power, which saves money.

Regarding **claim 38**, Wheeler, Christatos, Vitale and Rich disclose all the limitations of claim 38; therefore, claim 38 is rejected for the same reasons as in claim 16.

Regarding **claims 28 and 29**, Wheeler, Christatos and Rich disclose all the limitations of claims 28 and 29; therefore, claims 28 and 29 are rejected for the same reasons as in claims 16 and 17, respectively.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **JUNIOR O. MENDOZA** whose telephone number is (571)270-3573. The examiner can normally be reached on **Monday - Friday 9am - 5pm EST**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571)272-7296. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Junior O Mendoza
Examiner
Art Unit 2423

/J. O. M./
December 10, 2008

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423